

have long urged closer relations with Mexico. We have much in common, yet throughout our history U.S. policy toward Mexico has been far more one of neglect than of mutual respect and cooperation.

Whether it is trade and investment, immigration, the environment, health, science, cultural and academic exchange, human rights, drug trafficking, weapons smuggling and other cross border crime and violence—our contiguous countries are linked in numerous ways. We should work to deepen and expand our relations.

The Merida Initiative is one approach, and while I and many others would prefer that it encompassed broader forms of engagement, it is a start. Most of the funds are for law enforcement hardware and software, which is necessary but insufficient to support a sustainable strategy. As we have learned from successive costly counterdrug strategies in the Andean countries that have failed to effectively reduce the amount of cocaine entering the United States, we need to know what the Merida Initiative can reasonably expect to achieve, at what cost, over what period of time.

Senator GREGG as ranking member, and I as chairman of the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee had to make difficult choices among many competing demands within a limited budget. We had to find additional funds to help disaster victims in Burma, Central Africa, Bangladesh and elsewhere, whom the President's budget ignored. We had to find additional funds for Iraqi refugees and for crucial peacekeeping, security, and nonproliferation programs. We could not have funded virtually any program at the level requested by the President without causing disproportionate harm to others, and we sought to avoid that.

Considering the amount we had to spend, the Merida Initiative received strong, bipartisan support. Again, this is not simply a 3 year program as the administration suggests. It is the beginning of a new kind of relationship, and we need to start off prudently and with solid footing.

That means the direct participation of the Congress and of civil society and attention to legitimate concerns about human rights, about monitoring and oversight, about rights of privacy, due process, and accountability. How these issues are resolved is critical to future funding for this program, and we need to work together to address them.

MATTHEW SHEPARD ACT OF 2007

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would strengthen and add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a

separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On Thursday evening, May 15, 2008, in Sacramento, CA, a 23-year-old man was sitting in his car at a gas station when he was approached by three men. According to police, one of the men asked him if he was gay and he responded that he was. When the man then exited the car, he was attacked by the three men as they yelled homophobic slurs. Micah Jontomo Tasaki, 21, Gregory Lee Winfield, 20, and Robert Lee Denor, 19, were arrested at the gas station where the attack occurred in connection with the assault. Luckily for the victim, he did not sustain injuries serious enough to necessitate a hospital visit. A Sacramento police officer investigating the crime has called it a "gay bashing" and a hate crime.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. Federal laws intended to protect individuals from heinous and violent crimes motivated by hate are woefully inadequate. This legislation would better equip the Government to fulfill its most important obligation by protecting new groups of people as well as better protecting citizens already covered under deficient laws. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

SOLUTIONS TO CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, earlier this spring, I introduced legislation to address the challenge of how to deal with greenhouse gases. The bill is called the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Atmospheric Removal Act, or the GEAR Act.

Members of this body have discussed various proposals to regulate the output of greenhouse gases. Some advocate doing it through a cap-and-trade approach. Others have advocated a carbon tax. Such proposals are aimed at limiting future carbon output into the atmosphere. Many proposals have been introduced and debated using this approach of dealing with carbon output.

We want to protect our environment and we want a strong economy. The way to have both is by thinking anew and acting anew. It is time to use our untapped human potential and the American spirit to develop the technologies we need.

The Senate will soon be debating climate legislation. I believe we should identify solutions through imagination, innovation, and invention, not through limits.

It is my hope and my goal that the GEAR Act will foster the kind of solutions that we need to address the concerns about climate change.

Recently, there was a very thoughtful editorial which was printed in "Wyoming Agriculture," which is published by the Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation.

The editorial was written by Ken Hamilton. Ken is the executive vice

president of the Wyoming Farm Bureau. I believe he does a terrific job of summing up the feelings of Wyoming people on the need to find practical "real" solutions to climate change.

I recommend it to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

YOU CAN'T HAVE YOUR CAKE AND EAT IT TOO

(By Ken Hamilton, WyFB Executive Vice President)

One of the first little sayings you probably heard when you were growing up was that you can't have your cake and eat it too. Generally everyone will agree that this is self evident, but that doesn't stop Americans (and probably people in other countries) from always trying to have it both ways.

This is never more evident than the actions surrounding global warming. We are continually being bombarded by pronouncements about man caused global warming (it's hovering around 4 degrees with a 25 mph breeze blowing as I write this). When I was discussing this global warming issue with a friend, he said what people need to do is stop arguing with the activists over whether there is man caused global warming and start asking them what their solutions are going to be.

The more I thought about it the more I realized the whole global warming debate is absent any discussion of real solutions. We hear vague pronouncements about a greenhouse gas tax, but not much else. And none have enough details to fully analyze what the impact will be on people. There are numerous shows on television where people are talking about reducing their "carbon footprint", but most of these solutions revolve around still living the lifestyle you want while feeling good about using a material someone has pronounced as "green."

For instance, one of the new "green" materials for flooring in houses now is bamboo. Why someone feels this is greener than oak or pine is beyond me, but nevertheless apparently it is. The interesting thing is that while everyone is talking green, they are busy building a house that's twice the square footage of a generation ago. Our grandparents lived in a house where one or two rooms had heat part of the time. In today's modern homes there is heat running to every room, plus a television set in half of them, a minimum two-car garage (heated of course) and appliances that grandma couldn't even dream about. All of these, of course have some "green" marketing gimmick attached to them, so, you guessed it, people can live in even bigger houses while feeling good about doing their part.

But if meaningful curbs in greenhouse gases must occur as they profess, then there shouldn't be houses with two-car garages. You don't find those sorts of things in third world countries where the people's carbon footprint is less than here. Dishwashers must go as well as washing machines, dryers, and central heating. In third world countries where they don't have such a big carbon footprint, health clubs are not needed, nor are double ovens.

Arnold Schwarzenegger, who is in a panic over global warming, should stop driving around in his Humvee. In fact, to adequately address this issue, he should stop driving period.

But we don't see any of this happening and probably won't in the future. The people worried about global warming are still driving to work every day. They come home to heated and air conditioned homes, turn on